Amendments to the Drawings

Replacement Sheets have been submitted to correct typographical errors in Figs. 2 and 4.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-19, 21, and 22 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 11, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 22 have been amended, claims 3, 4, and 20 have been canceled, and the specification and drawings have been amended for clarity. Applicants submit that none of the amendments presented herein raise new issues requiring further searching or consideration by the Examiner.

I. The § 112, First Paragraph, Rejection

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-3 and 5-22 were rejected on grounds that the specification fails to provide a written description of the features in base claims 1 and 19: "each combination assigned a different security classification." Applicants submit that the specification does provide a written description of these features.

For example, Table 2 on page 15 of the specification provides a list of various packet-pattern attributes. This table also identifies various combinations (e.g., valid combination I and valid combination II) of those attributes that are deemed to be valid. One of those attributes corresponds to an IPSec Security Parameter Index (SPI). As those skilled in the art understand, an SPI parameter provides an indication of whether or not a PDU was transmitted with encryption, and in some cases the SPI may also indicate what type of encryption was used.

Thus, in the context of the invention, it is therefore clear that a combination of packet-pattern attributes (e.g., Valid Combination I) that does not have an SPI is indicative of one level of security classification (e.g., encryption) and a combination of packet-pattern attributes (e.g.,

Valid Combination II) that has an SPI is indicative of a different level of security classification (e.g., no encryption).

Applicants therefore submit that the specification provides a written description of the subject matter of claims 1 and 19, in view of, for example, the disclosure at pages 15 and 16 with reference to Table 2. Withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1, 19, and their dependent claims is therefore respectfully requested.

The cancellation of claim 20 obviates the § 112, first paragraph, rejection based on lack of enablement.

II. The § 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claims 1-3 and 5-22 were rejected for being unclear.

Claims 1 and 19 were found to be objectionable on grounds that "different security classification" is unclear. Applicants submit that these features have clear and definite meaning when read in light of the specification. For example, one security classification may correspond to the situation where the header of a PDU does not include an SPI parameter, and a different security classification may correspond to the situation where a PDU header includes an SPI parameter, indicative of, for example, that encryption exists. See the preceding section of this paper for a more detailed explanation.

Claims 1 and 19 were also found to be objectionable on grounds that the word "different" in the phrase "different arrangement of said attributes" is not clear. But, Table 2 of the specification clearly shows, for example, that Valid Combinations I and II have different arrangements of packet-pattern attributes. (See the checked boxes in Table 2). Applicants therefore submit that this phrase has clear and definite meaning when read in view of the specification.

Claim 8 has been amended to delete the word "next" which the Examiner found to be objectionable. As presently amended, claim 8 recites that "the packet-pattern attributes include a protocol number (IPv4) attribute and a header (IPv6) attribute."

Claim 14 recites "static information" that was found to be unclear. This term has clear and definite meaning when read in view of the specification. For example, Paragraph [41] indicates that the static information management section may store static information for static subscribers. From the context of this disclosure, it is therefore apparent that the word "static" means existing, and therefore the static information management section is understood to store information for existing subscribers.

Other portions of the specification are consistent with this understanding. For example, from Paragraphs [41] and [42], it is clear that the static information may include, for example, filtering information, IP address(es), and/or IMSI information (which may, for example, correspond to an identifier for subscriber's mobile terminal).

When read in light of the specification, Applicants therefore submit that claim 14 has clear and definite meaning in the manner required by § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 16, 18, and 19 were rejected on grounds that "inquiring and/or updating" is unclear. Also, the phrase "and/or" is unclear. Claims 16 and 18 have been amended to recite "performing at least one of an inquiring updating operation for the registered packet call filtering information based on the inquiry and/or update message; and transferring a result of the inquiry and/or updating operation to the mobile terminal." These features are clearly understood with reference to the specification; see, for example, Paragraph [62].

Claims 21 and 22 have been amended to recite that the plurality of combinations include different numbers of the packet-pattern attributes or different arrangements of packet-pattern attributes.

Applicants request withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph, rejection in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

III. The Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 14-16, 18, and 19 were rejected for being obvious in view of the Uskela patent. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites the step of registering packet call filtering information that includes "a plurality of combinations of packet-pattern attributes, each combination assigned a different security classification and including different arrangements of said attributes." A determination is

then made as to whether to set a call connection based on a comparison of attributes in a received packet and the different combination of attributes. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that the Uskela patent does not teach or suggest these features.

Nevertheless, the Examiner merely gratuitously stated that these features would have been obvious. Applicants submit that a proper § 103(a) rejection cannot be based on a statement that claimed feature missing from the cited references would merely have been obvious. Rather, the Examiner must show that all the features recited in claim 1 are found in the cited references, in this case Uskela. Uskela does not teach or suggest registering packet call filtering information that includes a plurality of combinations of packet-pattern attributes, each combination assigned a different security classification and including different arrangements of said attributes. Accordingly, it is improper to reject claim 1 based solely on Uskela.

In addition to these features, claim 1 recites "activating one of a rejection filter or a permission filter based on information stored in the packet call filtering information" and setting the call connection according to "a result of determination and the activated filter, wherein the rejection filter blocks setting of the call if the comparison of the attribute information of the received packet matches one of the plurality of combinations of the packet-pattern attributes, and the permission filter allows the call to be set if the comparison of the attribute information of the received packet does not match any of the plurality of combinations of the packet-pattern attributes." (See, for example, Paragraphs [44], [65], [66] and Figure 6 for support). The Uskela patent does not teach or suggest these features.

Based on the foregoing differences, Applicants submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable. Claim 19 recites features similar to those that patentably distinguish claim 1 from the Uskela patent. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 19 and its dependent claims are allowable.

As for Figure 7, the specification discloses that there is a direct connection between the mobile terminal and agent. Such a direct connection can be established for example, from a serving node to the agent. Figure 7 has been amended to clarify that this connection, through path b, and corresponding portions of the specification have been amended to indicate the same. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments do not introduce new matter into the application, but rather merely clarify features of the invention in response to the Examiner's request. Withdrawal of the objections to the specification and drawings is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw
Date: December 18, 2007
Q:\Documents\2016-609\139313

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610